

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/368,354	BUCKLEY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Joseph R. Pokrzywa	2622	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Joseph R. Pokrzywa. (3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) John Fitzpatrick. (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 01-September 2004.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) discussed: 1

Identification of prior art discussed: See Continuation Sheet.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: \_\_\_\_\_

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Joseph R. Pokrzywa 9/1/04  
Examiner's signature, if required

Discussed the concept of undue burden reduction and how the applied reference of Vynke et al. does not specifically achieve the same claimed invention. The examiner will reconsider the rejection based on arguments.